HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Volume XII, No. 22 Saturday, May 28, 1955 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

JUN 3 1955

Hoover's Battle: The Herbert Hoover Reports — recommending large cuts in bureaucratic expenditure and entire abolition of some bureaus — have spread alarm among "liberals." In them, they see the straight-out issue between Left and Right, and they have always privately feared that the vast majority of the voters are at heart conservative.

The Hoover Reports, if put into effect, could immediately save 7 billions a year and balance the budget overnight. Future savings could be as much as 15 or 20 percent of what the budget would otherwise be.

But New Dealers still have high hopes; they know the political naivete and ineptitude of the Right. ADA-CIO-New Deal strategy, now well under way, already seeks to intimidate the Republicans. They say: "The Hoover program is strictly for Big Business. The people won't like it." (The assumption is that a 15 or 20 percent cut in the cost of government would help businessmen and hurt the people!)

Doris Fleeson (whose New Deal column is run in 70 newspapers, owned mostly by "reactionaries") devoted her May 20 column to the new theme song. She said the Hoover Reports were the biggest break the Democrats have had. But maybe — says Miss Fleeson — the Administration will be wise, realize the danger, and repudiate the Reports. And that, she says, would be terribly frustrating and disappointing to the Democrats who, she says, are eager to make "Hooverism" once more the issue in 1956.

Insiders from the General Accounting Building (where the Hoover group has headquarters) manifest fear that the real obstacle to success of the Hoover economy program lies in the White House. Most of the Hoover proposals must be adopted by the Executive, not Congress, before they can prove effective. Ike is said to be all for the Hoover program. But the real threat to Hooverism — it is said — comes from the "liberals" in the Administration, who listen to advice from Washington New Deal Democratic columnists.

Post-mortem on Polio: The polio vaccine fiasco, according to well-informed medical men, is the result of a fine scientific discovery being taken out of the hands of scientists and handed over to public relations men. Doctors complain that the polio findings, once Salk broke his discovery, were bottled up so that they might be released in a concentrated publicity splurge on April 12, the anniversary of Roosevelt's death — the fond dream of the public relations experts of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. Mr. Basil O'Connor, once FDR's law partner and President of the Foundation, comes in for a lot of blame. Pharmaceutical company officials also complain. From the first, they went into the scheme with protests and many doubts, because they were obviously not given sufficient time to produce enough vaccine to meet public needs on the April 12 deadline imposed by the publicity masterminds of the Foundation.

Roads Bill: Senator Harry Byrd (D., Va.) is the man-of-the-week in Congress because of his successful defeat of the Eisenhower highway proposal and his support of the Democratic substitute bill — which avoids the Administration's plan to service the road program outside the Federal budget and apart from the national debt. Byrd labelled this "dishonest bookkeeping." The great economy advocate from Virginia won, in large part, by division in the GOP Senate ranks — thirteen Republicans, mostly Westerners, joining the Democrats in the voting. This is reminiscent of the traditional coalition in the upper house — "Taft Republicans" aligned with "Byrd Democrats."

Presidential Draft: A remark of GOP Senate Leader Knowland, while noted by many who heard him on TV last Sunday, seems to have escaped the daily press entirely. The California Senator some weeks ago said that he did not approve of a "reluctant candidate for president." Last Sunday,

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when queried on the subject on TV, he replied that he did not think the Republican party could afford a "reluctant candidate," thereby indicating his objection to a "presidential draft." When the Senate Leader of the GOP, in the midst of a developing demand for a "draft" of Eisenhower makes such a statement, it is surprising that it is not considered "news."

Because of GAW: As Capital observers see it, any concession for a Guaranteed Annual Wage made to the union by Ford and GM might well mark the beginning of a break between small and "middle" business on the one hand and "summit" business on the other. For many decades, all businessmen regarded themselves as possessing a common interest. Now, a GAW deal — while perhaps satisfactory to the two "Bigs" in the auto industry — would probably be resented by smaller business firms, who could not afford to make such concessions to labor unions. It is noted here that Charles R. Sligh of Grand Rapids, Michigan, former head of the National Association of Manufacturers, on May 25 said that GAW "would hurt small business firms even more than big companies" and would act as a "very serious deterrent to business."

Education Front: In the last forty-eight hours, revolt broke out against tight control by "liberal" elements in the National Parent-Teachers Association convention in Chicago. Illinois parents protested inclusion of UN and UMT on the national program. Indianans claimed that their delegation to the convention was packed by a self-perpetuating board of the organization. The opposition to Federal Aid to Education, which the "bosses" of PTA favor, is rising. The retiring President of the organization had to recognize the possibility of formation of a new, rival organization to the national PTA.

Why They Lost: Why the GOP has lost out in two elections in the last year in Michigan is a question now answered by William L. White, President of the Jackson County (Mich.) Republican club as follows: (1) Failure of the GOP to keep in touch with grass-roots sentiment; (2) Failure to fight back at Democrats; (3) Voters were alienated by the spectacle of the Army-McCarthy hearings and the "smear of McCarthy by the Administration;" (4) The Eisenhower Administration's defeat of the Bricker Amendment caused "thousands of Republicans . . . to either stay at home on election day or to vote Democratic."

White told *Chicago Tribune* reporter Percy Wood (May 23) that future success and recovery of the GOP in Michigan involved a party apology to Senator McCarthy and full support of the Bricker Amendment.

Foreign Affairs: Representative Lawrence Smith (Rep., Wis.) said in a letter to his constituents this week: "The Democrats have had their Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam. The Republicans have had their Geneva where Indochina went down the river. The results of the Austrian Peace Treaty are still unknown. The Republicans cannot afford any more diplomatic blunders."

Lattimore Story: The real story about the granting of a passport to Owen Lattimore, former Government Far Eastern expert, now under indictment, is leaking out. It shows that the Passport Office, of its own volition, did not issue the passport. Mrs. Ruth Shipley, former head of the passport division of the State Department, had turned down the Lattimore application. But Herman Phleger, State Department Legal Adviser, differed with Mrs. Shipley and after several conferences on the matter with White House aides, decided in favor of Lattimore's request. Meanwhile, Mrs. Shipley had retired from service and her successor, Frances Knight, received a directive from Secretary Dulles ordering her to grant the Lattimore passport. Miss Knight therefore had to do so.

Bipartisanship: "There is nearly always fundamental disagreement on foreign policy matters," said Senator McCarthy this week, "both between parties and between the individual members of the parties. So what bipartisanship really means is that you should *conceal* your disagreement. You are supposed to pretend that you agree in order to convince the world that there is unity in America. You are supposed to abandon your principles, to ignore your personal judgments, to say that black is white and wrong is right, to do anything and everything that is needed to give the impression that everybody in America thinks alike. I just don't believe that 'unity' is worth that price." (From a speech at Buffalo, New York, May 24.)

Status of Forces: A nationwide tide of bitter opposition to the Status of Forces Treaty has finally borne fruit in Congress under circumstances which prompt demands that the Treaty be cancelled by Congressional action. Ratified by the Senate in 1953, at the direct insistence of the White House, it turned American soldiers abroad over to foreign courts for civilian offenses. At the time of ratification, Senator Bricker pointed out that the Acheson State Department had been for some time surrendering American soldiers without specific treaty authority and read letters revealing some tragic cases.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Among these was that of a soldier convicted in a trial in which he had not been permitted to put on his own witnesses; another where a soldier suffering from tuberculosis had been confined in a damp underground cell; and the case of still another who on appealing his sentence had his original sentence increased from ten months to sixteen. It is estimated that there are many of our soldiers in foreign jails after being subjected to judicial procedures which often departed widely from those guaranteed a citizen under the Constitution. The exact number is not generally known because the Defense Department has given out very few figures.

Furious parents have steadily bombarded Congress with letters of protest against the Treaty — but the break did not come until last week.

In the midst of the debate over the UMT bill of the Administration, Representative Frank Bow (Rep., Ohio) proposed an amendment which would bar the sending of any trainees under the program to nations making use of the Status of Forces Treaty to impose their judicial procedures on American soldiers.

On a division vote (only the "ayes" and "noes" are recorded) the Bow proposal was approved by a stunning majority of 174-56. First-hand observers say that if a record vote (names of those voting are recorded after their vote) had been taken, the majority would have been still larger. A division vote enabled some to vote against the Bow amendment because their constituents would not know how they voted.

After such a sweeping victory Representative Bow, on the same day, introduced a resolution in the House directing the President to renegotiate the Treaty and, if the foreign countries would not agree to then "denounce" it, to make it void.

In view of the House's impressive response to the Bow Amendment, it is quite possible that, as the 1956 elections approach, there will be a successful Congressional revolution against the Status of Forces Treaty. From what has happened, it appears that "grass-roots" sentiment does register if persistent enough.

Problem of Prodigality: The Veterans' Administration operates two major insurance programs. Under one (called United States Life Insurance) for World War I veterans, there are 423,000 policies outstanding totalling $1,836,000,000 of life and disability coverage. The other (National Service Life Insurance) for veterans of World War II and the Korean War has 6,188,000 policies in force aggregating $41,581,000,000 of insurance.

Through these two programs, veterans enjoy life insurance protection which costs the insured less than any other such coverage in the world. Private companies cannot possibly match either the premium rates or the dividends of these government policies, because VA charges its administrative costs to the Treasury and because its insurance business is totally tax-exempt, has no selling costs and receives directly from the U.S. Government reimbursements for extra hazardous death benefit payments.

There are three views about this low cost VA insurance: (1) Veterans should be compelled to convert their policies into private insurance at higher premium rates and smaller dividends. This plan would take the VA out of the insurance business. (2) Continue "as is." (3) Permit the veteran to keep his low cost insurance, but alter VA policies so as to save taxpayers billions in future claims.

From its inception in 1940 through 1953, the National Life Insurance program has taken in $6,170,000,000 in premium payments. The Treasury Department has added approximately $4,500,000,000 for extra hazardous death benefits. In consequence, the program has had a gross income of $10,670,000,000. On the disbursement side $2,988,000,000 has been paid out on death benefits and $3,076,000,000 in dividends which have reduced premium costs to an incredibly low level. Additionally, $128,679,000 has been paid out for disability benefits. Total disbursements have, therefore, amounted to $6,192,679,000 leaving a net income of $4,477,321,000. This net income has been invested in government bonds and so far has earned $1.5 billions in *interest,* paid in more bonds. VA has thus under one insurance program a claim of some 6 billions against the taxpayers.

Fiscal experts are asking some questions about the VA in view of the large income of National Life Insurance. Why has Congress year after year permitted VA to burden taxpayers with its administrative costs. Last year VA administrative costs came to around $37,000,000 and since 1940 are estimated to have run over *half a billion.* Why shouldn't Congress immediately require VA to take its administrative costs out of its lush insurance income?

The premium rates on VA insurance are less than half those of private companies. This is a large bonanza in itself. But in addition VA has paid dividends on its policies of over *three billions* — dividends that private companies couldn't pay and which amount to a second bonanza. Isn't this too much of a good thing?

Finally the reimbursement policies of the government for extra hazardous death benefits are con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sidered too liberal even in veteran circles. In World War II, such reimbursements covered 70 percent of all death benefits. In the Korean War, they rose to 75 percent. Since then, they have dropped to 40 percent. Why, in peacetime, should such large reimbursements be allowed? It would seem that Congress should re-examine the VA insurance business with an eye to doing justice to the veteran but also with an eye to keeping the taxpayers' bounty within reasonable limits.

Admiral Ambassador to Russia, by W. H. Standley. The Henry Regnery Company, 20 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Illinois. Price $6. Reviewed by James L. Wick.

Admiral Ambassador to Russia is a sober responsible account of the wartime experiences of Admiral William H. Standley, yet its high spots are so sensational that *Confidential* Magazine could reprint them — without exaggeration — under the title "Exposure of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Averell Harriman, Wendell Willkie and Joseph E. Davies."

Standley was Roosevelt's first Chief of Naval Operations. He was Acting Secretary of the Navy during the long illness of Claude Swanson. It was logical, therefore, for him to be appointed to the commission that investigated the Pearl Harbor disaster. The blame was put upon General Short and Admiral Kimmel. Today, after studying the evidence withheld in 1942, Standley says if the two officers had been given a fair trial, they would have been cleared.

Standley was a member of the Harriman-Beaverbrook Lend-lease Mission to Russia in 1941. Averell Harriman, the chairman, explained the purpose of the Mission: "to give and give and give, with no expectation of return, with no thought of a *quid pro quo*."

In March, 1942, Standley was sent to Moscow as Ambassador. In that post, he found himself subjected to constant humiliation by Roosevelt's "special emissaries" to Russia such as Willkie and Davies, each of whom was better informed than he about conversations between the White House and the Kremlin. The Ambassador resigned in 1943, convinced he was prevented from being of service by his own government.

The Admiral gives a detailed story of Willkie's visit to Russia. Willkie's thought processes were illuminated when he asked Soviet officials for permission to "travel freely and meet the people of the Soviet Union." Willkie told Vishinsky: "I guarantee that when I return to the United States, I will place the Soviet Union in a much more favorable light before the American people."

When Vishinsky expressed disbelief, Willkie continued: "I assure you that if I see something which I don't particularly like, or which if revealed in the United States, might create an unfavorable impression, I will keep quiet about it. The greatest desire of my life is to improve Soviet-American relations."

Joseph E. Davies went to Moscow with credentials from Roosevelt to present to Marshal Stalin his film, "Mission to Moscow." The picture contained so much childish exaggeration that the Russian government dared not show it. Standley's reaction, noted in his diary, was "Nauseating."

America's Lend-lease representative in Moscow was General Faymonville. Standley hoped to use Lend-lease as a trading point to get information about Russia's tactics and its use of American equipment against the Germans. Russian experience could save American lives. But Faymonville — says Standley — insisted upon giving the Russians everything they wanted, with nothing to be asked in return.

Admiral Standley is best known for his "Great Diplomatic Indiscretion." Alarmed that the Soviet press never mentioned the billions of American Lend-lease, the Admiral told the American correspondents in Moscow: "The American Congress is a big-hearted generous body of men, who will go to great lengths to help a friend if they know their efforts are really helpful, but . . . the Russian authorities seem to want to cover up the fact that they are receiving outside help."

Instantly, the pro-Soviet columnists and commentators in the USA screamed for the Ambassador's diplomatic head. But, Molotov and Stalin hastened to tell the Russian people about American help!

Relations between Roosevelt and Standley, however, chilled. Robert E. Sherwood's book says the White House disapproved of the blunt statement. Before long, the Admiral offered his resignation. He was not pressed to remain.

His successor was Harriman, who confidently told Standley as he left for Moscow: "Stalin can be handled." At Yalta, Harriman, Hiss, Hopkins and General George Marshall helped Roosevelt "handle" Stalin.

Admiral Ambassador to Russia is a book worth buying for (1) yourself; (2) the Public Library; (3) your son or daughter in college; (4) their professors. You can buy it from HUMAN EVENTS at the bookstore price of $6. With EACH book, we will give you a free 8-weeks' subscription to HUMAN EVENTS. You may have the 8 weeks added to your subscription. Better yet, send the subscription to someone else who should be reading HUMAN EVENTS. In sending us your orders, specify the names and addresses of those to whom you want (1) books sent, (2) subscriptions sent. Allow two weeks for fulfillment of subscriptions and books.

Letter from the HONORABLE SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL, Author, Radio Commentator and former Member of Congress (Indiana): "HUMAN EVENTS is the old-time reporter who digs out the facts from the official pap and then shrewdly assays the results. All who dislike being boobs should subscribe."

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor, and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.
Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XII, No. 22 HUMAN EVENTS May 28, 1955

Article Section

KOHLER OF KOHLER

Reuther Has Lost a 14-Month-Old Strike

By CHESLY MANLY

WALTER REUTHER, whose thunderous manifestoes terrify industrial magnates and politicians, has been defeated in a test of wills by one of the last survivors of a great American species: the Rugged Individualist. The victor is Herbert V. Kohler of Kohler, Wisconsin, whose company is the nation's second largest producer of plumbing fixtures and also makes electric power units, gasoline engines, shells for the army and jet engine parts for the air force.

A strike called by Local 833 of Reuther's CIO United Automobile Workers union on April 5, 1954, has been won by the company, despite a reign of terror, imposed by goons imported from Detroit, in Wisconsin's predominantly rural and normally peaceful Sheboygan county. Although the big plant in Kohler village was shut down by mob violence for eight weeks after the strike began, the company reported a net profit for 1954 and now is operating at more than 85 percent of capacity. Some 2,500 employees, out of a normal working force of 3,600, originally took part in the strike, but hundreds of them have drifted back to work. Many more new employees have been hired. Kohler has fired 90 union leaders, including Allan J. Graskamp, president of the local, all members of the executive committee and all shop stewards, for violence and other misconduct.

Moreover, he has announced that new employees hired during the strike will not be replaced by the strikers when and if they decide to come back to work. Whatever the National Labor Relations Board may say about this, Kohler is fortified by the Supreme court's opinion in NLRB vs. MacKay Radio and Telegraph Company (304 U.S. 333) that an employer "is not bound to discharge those hired to fill the places of strikers, upon the election of the latter to resume their employment, in order to create places for them."

The strikers have lost millions of dollars in wages which they will never recover. The rich international union can afford to lose the strike benefits it has paid out, but Reuther's personal prestige is heavily committed and it is hard to see how he can save face. The president of both the UAW and the CIO has made two trips to Sheboygan to encourage the strikers, and one of his lieutenants, Robert Burkhart, has directed operations since the strike began.

KOHLER'S SUCCESS in defying the union, and his views on the issues involved, might be pondered with profit by the automobile industry, now considering Reuther's demand for a guaranteed annual wage. The issue in the Kohler strike is not wages. Average weekly earnings of the company's employees before the strike were $86.77, almost sixteen percent higher than the national average for the industry, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Most Kohler employees own their homes, some in Sheboygan and

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other communities, some in Kohler village, purchased from the company at cost. They drive expensive automobiles, including Cadillacs. The company granted a 3 cent hourly increase when the strike began, raising the hourly average to $2.02. Although the union demanded 20 cents an hour and 10 cents more for skilled workers, it soon cut its request in half and there is general agreement that it would accept the company's offer of 3 cents if it could get some kind of union security clause.

Compulsory unionism is the major issue. The union at first demanded a union shop, then a modified shop, and finally a maintenance of membership clause. The last demand was deemed essential to prevent wholesale defections, as a result of lost wages in a lost strike. Without such a provision, the union probably would lose a representation election.

Kohler vows that he will never submit to compulsory unionism. It is his quaintly logical conviction that free unionism means freedom to join or not to join.

But compulsory unionism is not the sole issue. The union, as Kohler sees it, wants to preempt the functions of management. It wants to dictate hiring and firing, seniority rules, promotions and merit increases and to substitute its own standard insurance and pension plan for those now in effect. In an interview, Burkhart reiterated such terms as "standard contract provisions" and "standard practices throughout the country."

"We want to establish the principle of an annual wage increase, based upon the improvement in production methods," he said. "Everything at the Kohler plant is on the incentive system. The Kohler company gets more for its production dollar than its competitors do."

This was a frank admission that the union wants a voice in management policies. It opposes any improvement in a company's competitive position as a result of increased efficiency and lower production costs. It insists that such savings should go into annual wage increases.

The company has been able to pay high wages and still maintain its competitive position in the industry, to the advantage of consumers, by constantly improving production methods. The free competitive enterprise system has raised the American standard of living to the highest level ever known by continually improving production methods. Thus, the quality is enhanced, costs are lowered, consumers are benefited and wages are increased.

KOHLER BELIEVES the union's policies would eliminate competition and force industry into European-type cartels, with disastrous consequences for the American standard of living. When industry could no longer meet union demands for higher wages, because of decreased efficiency and higher production costs, there would be powerful inducements for the government to take over the system.

Kohler believes the automobile manufacturers and some other large corporations have been shortsighted and even selfish in yielding to union demands which their smaller competitors cannot meet and then passing the increased costs on to consumers.

"In my conception," he says, "collective bargaining means just what the law defines it to be — attempting to arrive at an agreement on wages, hours and other terms and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conditions of employment. It does not mean joint management of the company. Nor does it mean that the union can say: 'These are our standard provisions. You must meet them.'

"We do not believe that all industry can or should be forced by the union into one pattern. The strength of American industry is its diversification. Conditions in the automobile industry differ from the plumbing industry. The mammoth industries like steel and coal have been passing on their added costs to consumers. Highly competitive industries like our own cannot do so and may suffer in the public mind, in comparison.

"But it is the abuses and distortion of collective bargaining to which we offer unrelenting resistance — the leveling pressures and the persistent attacks on and abuse of management in an effort to discredit it. Bona fide grievances can be fairly resolved, but it is our experience that grievances are concocted and nursed to accomplish chronic dissatisfaction — the obvious and constant effort to achieve imbalance rather than stability.

"We are unalterably opposed to compulsory unionism. Freedom of choice in representation must be sustained and the chance for the individual to speak for himself must be recovered if we are not to become a faceless and rigidly classed people."

MARX AND ENGELS, in the Communist M*anifesto,* declared: "The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie. . . . Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production. . . ."

Reuther voices opposition to Kremlin Communism, but not to Marxism. He was a vice president of the committee of sponsors of a golden anniversary meeting, last April 23, of the Marxist League for Industrial Democracy in New York. Burkhart, the strike generalissimo, has never filed an anti-Communist oath as required by the Taft-Hartley act for all union officers, although international representatives of the UAW, according to its own constitution, are officers. The *Toledo Blade* of August 7, 1946, listed Burkhart as a sponsor of Malcolm M. Walker, Socialist Workers Party candidate for Congress in Ohio's 9th district. The SWP, declared subversive by the attorney general, is a Trotskyist organization. When a reporter asked him about his connection with this subversive outfit, Burkhart in effect took the Fifth Amendment. "What is this, a political inquisition?" he demanded.

Wisconsin's "right to work" laws have been flouted with impunity by the terrorists. The administration of Governor Walter J. Kohler, Jr., an Eisenhower Republican, has been almost as craven as was Michigan's New Deal governor, Frank Murphy, when this same union waged its sitdown strikes against the automobile companies in 1936. The governor is a nephew of the Kohler Company president, but owns no stock in the company. Last summer, when the governor appealed for arbitration of the dispute and was hailed as a statesman by the union, his uncle reminded him of his duty to enforce the state's laws and said that should be his proper concern.

Wisconsin has a criminal statute which authorizes a maximum fine of $100 and imprisonment up to six months for preventing any person from engaging in lawful work.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sheriff Theodore Mosch became a hero to the union by his stalwart refusal to arrest goons who violated this law by slugging non-strikers with brass knuckles and kicking them in the groin. "Thank God there is a sheriff here who will put Kohler in his place," Reuther told the strikers.

Another statute authorizes the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board to issue restraining orders against interference with the pursuit of lawful employment. After a hearing, the WERB, on May 21, 1954, issued an order permitting only peaceful picketing and forbidding coercion of the non-strikers at the plant or in their homes. Not only this order, but an injunction commanding compliance with it, issued last September 1 by Circuit Court Judge Arnold Murphy, has been persistently violated by the terrorists. Last March 23, Circuit Judge Gerald J. Boileau took under advisement a civil contempt case against the international and local unions and 19 of their leaders including Burkhart and Graskamp who were charged with violating the court's injunction. For three days, oral and motion picture evidence of intimidation and coercion of non-strikers at the plant and in their homes was presented to Judge Boileau, but he deferred his decision pending a ruling by the state's supreme court on the question of jurisdiction. The union had challenged the jurisdiction of the WERB and of the Circuit court, insisting that the NLRB had exclusive jurisdiction in the case. The state Supreme court upheld the jurisdiction of the WERB and of the Circuit court on May 3, but Judge Boileau appeared to be in no hurry to enter his judgment.

Mrs. Beatrice Lampert, assistant attorney general, told Judge Boileau that the state was not seeking "punishment as such but compliance with the injunction." Meanwhile, the union has shown no disposition to comply. Violence continues unabated. More than 500 acts of violence and vandalism against non-strikers, including brutal beatings, shotgun blasts through windows of homes and dynamiting of automobiles, have been reported since the strike began.

KOHLER, A BIG, grim-visaged, soft-spoken and rather shy man, is going ahead with business as usual. Abused by union leaders as an ogre who delights in starving little children, he has the respect and affection of veteran employees, both men and women, who address him as "Herbert" as he stops to greet them on his daily rounds of the plant. As for his own business, Kohler is confident and serene, but a melancholy view of America's future burdens his thoughts. He is at once a triumphant and tragic figure, a symbol of values which have made America what it is and which few other industrialists have the courage to fight for. The attitude of most seems to be "after us the deluge."

Chesly Manly is the author of the definitive study of the New Deal: *The Twenty Year Revolution,* published by the Henry Regnery Company, Chicago.

Additional Copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25.
Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED